

2000 Market Street, 20th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19103-3222 Tel 215.299.2000 Fax 215.299.2150 www.foxrothschild.com

BRETT BERMAN Direct Dial: 215-299-2842 Email Address: BBerman@FoxRothschild.com

January 15, 2016

## **VIA ECF**

Chief Judge Carla E. Craig U.S. Bankruptcy Court, EDNY Conrad B. Duberstein Courthouse 271-C Cadman Plaza East, Suite 1595 Brooklyn, NY 11201-1800

Re: In Re: Hypnotic Taxi, LLC et al., No. 15-43300 (CEC)
Citibank, N.A. v. Bombshell Taxi, LLC, et al., Adv. Pro. No. 15-01185 (CEC)

Dear Chief Judge Craig:

Though we apologize for the barrage of letters to effectuate what should be entry of a straightforward order consistent with Your Honor's decision, we must (quickly) address two matters raised in Mr. Schwed's latest letter (ECF 76).

First, unless Citibank is suggesting that the attachment order entered in November (ECF 28) -- which *it* drafted -- was somehow deficient, there is no reason to enter a different order now. Again, your decision states clearly that the stay of the attachment order is lifted. The attachment process itself is then governed by state statute. Your Order need not -- and should not -- try to spell that out that process or potentially modify the statute itself. There is no need.

Second, in his letter, Mr. Schwed states that Mr. Freidman is the "garnishee" of the trust property (i.e., the NY real estate). This is incorrect. All agree the trust property was transferred in June 2015. It is one thing for your decision to state that attachment applies to third party assets, but another thing to change the reality that Mr. Freidman is now somehow the garnishee of those assets. He is not. Of course, since Citibank's main protection is in recording the attachment as the statute provides, it is of little consequence in any event who the "garnishee" is. Citibank -- via the sheriff -- will record the attachment against the real estate, ultimately much like it would a mortgage.

A Pennsylvania Limited Liability Partnership



Chief Judge Carla E. Craig January 15, 2016 Page 2

Frankly, delving into this minutia is exactly why Citibank's tendered order is inappropriate and unnecessary. The Court ordered attachment, the consequences of which, and processes, speak for themselves and are governed by underlying state statute.<sup>1</sup>

The order we tendered earlier is consistent with both the letter and spirit of your decision.

Respectfully,

Is Brett Berman

Brett Berman

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In its letter, Citibank effectively concedes that the applicable state statute does *not* contain an "inspection" right for real property.